



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,319	01/26/2001	Lira Nikolovska	US 010025	7697

24737 7590 02/22/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

PESIN, BORIS M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/772,319	NIKOLOVSKA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 09/10/2004.

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, and 27 are independent claims. In the Amendment A, Claims 1, 4, 10, 13, 14, 17, 23, 26, 27, 30, 34, and 35 were amended. This action is made Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hassell et al. ("Hassell," WO 00/46988).

As per independent claim 1, Hassell teaches a video display system a user interface system comprising: a video processor capable of receiving a main multimedia document and a plurality of additional multimedia documents from a matching engine, the matching engine capable of receiving the multimedia documents and identifying the plurality of additional multimedia documents that are at least one of visually related and conceptually related to the main multimedia documents (Page 23, Line 33 – Page 24,

Line 10); and a user interface controller capable of receiving at least one instruction from a user that selects a format for displaying said plurality of additional multimedia documents with said main multimedia document (page 28, lines 3-10), wherein said user interface controller is capable of displaying said plurality of additional multimedia documents on a display screen in the format selected by said user (page 18, lines 10-23 and page 20, lines 1-6).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Hassell teaches that the format for displaying said plurality of additional multimedia documents with said main multimedia document comprises one of: a horizontal linear format (page 20, lines 21-26), a vertical linear format (page 19, lines 29-33), and a collage format (page 25, lines 16-30).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Hassell teaches that the format for displaying said plurality of additional multimedia documents with said main multimedia document comprises at least one horizontal linear format (page 20, lines 21-26).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Hassell teaches that the format for displaying said plurality of additional multimedia documents with said main multimedia document further comprises at least one vertical linear format (page 19, lines 29-33).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Hassell teaches that the user interface controller is capable of receiving at least one instruction from a user that selects one of said plurality of additional multimedia documents to be displayed as a

main multimedia document (page 22, lines 3-13), and wherein said user interface controller is capable of displaying said selected one of said plurality of said additional multimedia documents on said display screen as a main multimedia document (page 22, lines 3-13).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Hassell teaches that in response to receiving a user instruction, said user interface controller is capable of displaying said plurality of additional multimedia documents on said display screen in a horizontal linear format (page 20, lines 21-26), and wherein in response to receiving a user instruction, said user interface controller is capable of sequentially moving said plurality of said additional multimedia documents on said display screen within said horizontal linear format (page 42, lines 2-9).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Hassell teaches that in response to receiving a user instruction, said user interface controller is capable of reversing the direction of the sequential movement of said plurality of said additional multimedia documents on said display screen within said horizontal linear format (page 42, lines 11-20), and wherein in response to receiving a user instruction, said user interface controller is capable of controlling the speed of movement of said plurality of said additional multimedia documents on said display screen within said horizontal linear format (page 42, lines 11-20, *i.e. stopping the ticker*).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Hassell teaches that in response to receiving a user instruction, said user interface controller is capable of displaying said plurality of additional multimedia documents on said display screen in a vertical linear

format, and wherein in response to receiving a user instruction, said user interface controller is capable of sequentially moving said plurality of said additional multimedia documents on said display screen within said vertical linear format (page 42, lines 9-20, *i.e. – top to bottom movement*).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Hassell teaches that in response to receiving a user instruction, said user interface controller is capable of reversing the direction of the sequential movement of said plurality of said additional multimedia documents on said display screen within said vertical linear format (page 42, lines 11-20), and wherein in response to receiving a user instruction, said user interface controller is capable of controlling the speed of movement of said plurality of said additional multimedia documents on said display screen within said vertical linear format (page 42, lines 11-20, *i.e. stopping the ticker*).

Claim 10 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Hassell teaches that the plurality of multimedia documents comprises at least one of: a multimedia document containing a link to another document location, a multimedia document containing all of a video document, a multimedia document containing a portion of a larger video document, and a multimedia document that contains a summary of a video document (page 42, lines 16-26, *a link to another document location* and page 20, lines 10-15).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Hassell teaches that the user interface controller is capable of displaying said plurality of additional multimedia

documents on said display screen to cause individual multimedia documents to appear and disappear on said display screen (page 19, lines 11-18).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, Hassell teaches that the display controller is capable of executing: a collage display application capable of displaying said plurality of additional multimedia documents with said main multimedia document in a collage format (page 25, lines 16-30); a horizontal linear display application capable of displaying said plurality of additional multimedia documents with said main multimedia document in a horizontal linear format (page 20, lines 21-26); a vertical linear display application capable of displaying said plurality of additional multimedia documents with said main multimedia document in a vertical linear format (page 19, lines 29-33); a multimedia document selection application capable of displaying a selected one of said plurality of additional multimedia documents as a main multimedia document (page 22, lines 3-13); and a linear display control application capable of receiving at least one user instruction for controlling the display of said additional multimedia documents in said horizontal linear format and in said vertical linear format (page 42, lines 11-20).

Claims 14-26 are similar in scope to claims 1-13, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 27-32 are similar in scope to claims 1-6, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 33 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 34 and 35 are similar in scope to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 36 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 37 is similar in scope to claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 38 is similar in scope to claim 12, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/10/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that Hassell does not teach a device that is capable of identifying a plurality of additional multimedia documents that are at least one of visually related and conceptually related to a main multimedia document. The Examiner disagrees with the Applicants argument because Hassell teaches, "There may be a video window 82 that may display a default video upon activation of the business channel. There may also be a text/graphic update window 92 that may display a default text/graphic update upon activation of the business channel. There may be configurable stock ticker 90 that may ~~be~~ display a default set of stock price quotes upon ~~LV~~ activation of the business channel." (Page 24 Lines 1-7). All these things are displayed upon activation of the business channel.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100